

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_**

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/816,552	03/23/2001	Mark S. Igra	41017.P003	6531
25943	7590	09/22/2004	EXAMINER	
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. PACWEST CENTER, SUITES 1600-1900 1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE PORTLAND, OR 97204			HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2179		

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/816,552	IGRA, MARK S.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Doug Hutton	2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08202002</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term “number” on Page 1, Lines 13 and 15 should be amended to — numbers — so that the sentences read more clearly; and
- the term “to” should be inserted between the terms “refers” and “the” on Page 7, Line 13 so that the sentence reads more clearly.

Appropriate correction is required.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: “third control section” (Claim 26, Line 8); and “third content section” (Claim 26, Line 10).

***Claim Objections***

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “specifying said first content for said first resultant web page to be generated” in Lines 7-8 should be deleted because this limitation is repetitive of the previous limitation “defining first content for a first resultant web page to be

generated;” in other words, the examiner cannot determine the difference between “defining” and “specifying” the first content;

- the phrase “specifying said second content for said second resultant web page to be generated” in Lines 11-12 has the same problem;
- the comma after the term “specification” in Line 8 should be deleted so that the claim reads more clearly;
- the term “navigation” in Lines 9 and 13 should be amended to — navigation arrangement — because that is how the element is previously identified (see Line 4); and
- the term “content” should be inserted between the terms “common” and “placement” in Line 17 because that is how the element is previously identified (“common content placement” – see Line 3).

Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “a specification of” in Line 2 should be deleted so the claim reads more clearly; as currently worded, the claim says that the “specification specifies through a specification.”

Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term “specification” in Line 3 should be amended to — definition — because that is how the element is subsequently identified (see Claim 10, Line 4).

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “as well as both of” in Line 2 should be amended to — and — so the claim reads more clearly; and
- the term “subordinate” should be deleted because the element is previously identified simply as “web page specifications” (see Lines 2-3).

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “as well as both of” in Line 2 should be amended to — and — so the claim reads more clearly.

Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “subordinate web page” should be inserted between the terms “first” and “specification” in Line 11 because that is how the element is previously identified (“first subordinate web page specification” – see Line 6).

Claim 23 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term “adopted” should be deleted because the element is previously identified simply as “web page specifications” (see Claim 22, Line 3).

Claim 24 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “using the XHTML” in Line 3 should be amended to — using XHTML — so the claim reads more clearly.

Claim 26 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term “ore” in Line 3 should be amended to — or — because it appears to be a typographic mistake.

Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term “ore” in Line 7 should be amended to — or — because it appears to be a typographic mistake.

Claim 31 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term “specification” should be inserted between the terms “page” and “specifies” in Line 8 because that is how the element is previously identified (“first subordinate web page specification” – see Claim 28, Line 9).

Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term “ore” in Line 3 should be amended to — or — because it appears to be a typographic mistake.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Drawings***

Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as – PRIOR ART – because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-23, 26-29, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ferrel et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,860,073.

***Claim 1:***

Ferrel discloses a web page generation method (see Column 1, Lines 5-7), comprising:

Art Unit: 2179

- defining a master specification (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses a “master specification” in that the multimedia publishing system includes templates comprising controls and style sheets) specifying a common style (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses a “common style” in that the multimedia publishing system includes style sheets that specify the particular font in which to display the content of the web page), a common navigation arrangement (see Specification of present application at Page 7, Lines 13-14, where the “navigation arrangement” is very broadly defined as “supported transitions between the web pages;” in Ferrel, see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses a “common navigation” in that the multimedia publishing system includes a “Page 1” format layout and a “Page 2” format layout so that the online newspaper has a distinctive “look and feel” that “supports transitions” between the pages), and common content placement for each resultant web page to be generated (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses “common content placement” in that the multimedia publishing system includes controls that specify the particular content to be displayed on the web pages and where to display said content on said pages);
- defining a first subordinate content specification (460-466, Figure 8) specifying first content of a first resultant web page (the story objects includes the “first content”), referencing the master specification for style, navigation and content

placement (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses this limitation in that the story object references the associated control and the corresponding style sheet to determine the “style” in which to display the content, to access the formatting provided by the style sheets and to determine what content to display on the web page and where to display said content on said page);

- defining a second subordinate content specification (470-474, Figure 8) specifying second content of a second resultant web page (the story objects includes the “second content”), referencing the master specification for style, navigation and content placement (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses this limitation in that the story object references the associated control and the corresponding style sheet to determine the “style” in which to display the content, to access the formatting provided by the style sheets and to determine what content to display on the web page and where to display said content on said page); and
- generating said first and second resultant web pages with said first and second contents being placed and styled in accordance with said common placement and style specified by said master specification, and said first and second resultant web pages having said common navigation arrangement specified by said master specification (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses this limitation as clearly indicated

in the cited figure and text; also, the foregoing discussion indicates that Ferrel discloses these elements).

*Claim 2:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said defining of a master specification specifying a common style comprises specifying a reference to a style definition (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 19, Lines 8-11 – Ferrel discloses a “reference to a style definition” in that the templates include controls that reference style sheets; these style sheets specify the fonts to be used when displaying the content on the web pages).

*Claim 3:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said defining of a master specification specifying a common navigation arrangement comprises specifying a reference to a navigation arrangement (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 8-11 – Ferrel discloses a “reference to a navigation arrangement” in that the templates include controls that reference style sheets; these style sheets specify the “Page 1” format layout and the “Page 2” format layout to be used when displaying the content on the web pages).

*Claim 4:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said defining of a master specification specifying a common content placement comprises specifying said content placement within said master specification (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 8-11 – Ferrel discloses “specifying said content placement within said master specification” in that the templates include controls that reference style sheets; these style sheets specify what content to display on the web pages and where to display said content on said pages).

*Claim 5:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein each of said defining of a first and a second subordinate content specification specifying first and second content of a first and a second resultant web page is made using a markup language having language elements for specifying control information in a control section, and said referencing of the master specification comprises specifying a reference to said master specification in said control section (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 36-50 – Ferrel discloses “using a markup language to specify control information in a control section” and “specifying a reference to said master specification in said control section” in that the story objects are HTML documents that reference style sheets to retrieve formatting information).

*Claim 6:*

Ferrel discloses a web page generation method (see Column 1, Lines 5-7), comprising:

- receiving a master specification (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses a “master specification” in that the multimedia publishing system includes templates comprising controls and style sheets) defining a common design for resultant web pages to be generated (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses a “common design” in that the multimedia publishing system includes templates comprising controls and style sheets), specifying common content placement (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses “common content placement” in that the multimedia publishing system includes controls that specify the particular content to be displayed on the web pages and where to display said content on said pages) and at least one of common style (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses a “common style” in that the multimedia publishing system includes style sheets that specify the particular font in which to display the content of the web page) and common navigation arrangement for each of said resultant web pages to be generated (see Specification of present application at Page 7, Lines 13-14, where the “navigation arrangement” is very broadly defined as “supported transitions between the web pages;” in Ferrel, see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses a “common navigation” in that

the multimedia publishing system includes a "Page 1" format layout and a "Page 2" format layout so that the online newspaper has a distinctive "look and feel" that "supports transitions" between the pages);

- receiving a first subordinate web page specification (460-466, Figure 8) defining first content for a first resultant web page to be generated (the story objects include the "first content"), specifying said first content for said first resultant web page to be generated (the story objects "specify the first content"), and referencing the master specification for content placement and at least one of style and navigation (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses this limitation in that the story objects reference the associated controls and the corresponding style sheets to determine what content to display on the web pages and where to display said content on said pages, to determine the "style" in which to display the content and to access the formatting provided by the style sheets);
- receiving a second subordinate web page specification (470-474, Figure 8) defining second content for a second resultant web page to be generated (the story objects include the "second content"), specifying said second content for said second resultant web page to be generated (the story objects "specify the second content"), and referencing the master specification for content placement and at least one of style and navigation (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses this limitation in that the story objects reference the associated controls and the corresponding style

sheets to determine what content to display on the web pages and where to display said content on said pages, to determine the “style” in which to display the content and to access the formatting provided by the style sheets); and

- generating said first and second resultant web pages with said first and second contents being placed, styled and/or having a common navigation arrangement in accordance with said common placement and at least one of style and navigation arrangement specified by said master specification (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses this limitation as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text; also, the foregoing discussion indicates that Ferrel discloses these elements).

*Claim 7:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 6, wherein said master specification specifies said common style through a specification of a reference to a style definition (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 19, Lines 8-11 – Ferrel discloses a “reference to a style definition” in that the templates include controls that reference style sheets; these style sheets specify the fonts to be used when displaying the content on the web pages).

*Claim 8:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 7, wherein said master specification specifies said common design employing a markup language having language

elements for specifying control information in a control section, and said specification of a reference to a style definition comprises specification of said reference to said style definition in said control section (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 36-50 – Ferrel discloses “employing a markup language to specify control information in a control section” and “specifying a reference to said style definition in said control section” in that the templates are HTML documents that reference style sheets to retrieve formatting information).

*Claim 9:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 6, wherein said master specification specifies said common navigation arrangement through specification of a reference to a navigation specification (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 8-11 – Ferrel discloses a “reference to a navigation specification” in that the templates include controls that reference style sheets; these style sheets specify the “Page 1” format layout and the “Page 2” format layout to be used when displaying the content on the web pages).

*Claim 10:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 9, wherein said master specification specifies said common design employing a markup language having language elements for specifying control information in a control section, and said specification of a reference to a navigation definition comprises specifying a reference to a navigation specification in said control section (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 36-50 – Ferrel

discloses "employing a markup language to specify control information in a control section" and "specifying a reference to a navigation specification in said control section" in that the templates are HTML documents that reference style sheets to retrieve formatting information).

*Claim 11:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 6, wherein said master specification specifies said common design employing a markup language having language elements for specifying content in a content section, and said specification of said common content placement comprises specifying said content placement in said content section (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 36-50 – Ferrel discloses "specifying common design by employing a markup language to specify content in a content section" and "specifying said content placement in said content section" in that the templates are HTML documents that specify the particular content to be displayed on the web pages and where to display said content on said pages).

*Claim 12:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 6, wherein both of said first and second subordinate web page specifications specify said first and second content of said first and second resultant web pages using a markup language having language elements for specifying control information in a control section, and each of said referencing to the master specification comprises specifying a reference to said master specification in the

control section (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 36-50 – Ferrel discloses “specifying content by using a markup language to specify control information in a control section” and “specifying a reference to said master specification in said control section” in that the story objects are HTML documents that reference style sheets to retrieve formatting information).

*Claim 13:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 6, wherein:

- said master specification as well as both of said first and second web page specifications express the respective specifications using a markup language having language elements for specifying control information in a control section (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 36-50 – Ferrel discloses “specifying the master and first and second web page specifications by using a markup language to specify control information in a control section” in that the templates and the story objects are HTML documents that reference style sheets to retrieve formatting information; these references to the style sheets in the templates and the story objects are the “control information”);
- said specification of at least one of a common style and a navigation arrangement comprises specifying at least one of a reference to a style definition and a reference to a navigation arrangement in the control section of the master specification (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 36-50 – Ferrel discloses “specifying at least one of a reference to a style definition and a reference to a

navigation arrangement in the control section of the master specification" in that the templates are HTML documents that reference style sheets to retrieve formatting information);

- said first and second subordinate web page specifications specify first and second other control information in first and second control sections of the first and second subordinate web page specifications respectively (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 36-50 – Ferrel discloses "first and second other control information in first and second control sections of the first and second subordinate web page specifications" in that the story objects are HTML documents that reference style sheets to retrieve formatting information; these references to the style sheets in the story objects are the "other control information"); and
- each of said generating of said first and second resultant web pages comprises merging said specification of at least one of a reference to a style definition and a reference to a navigation arrangement in the control section of the master specification and the corresponding one of said first and second other control information in the control section of the corresponding one of said first and second subordinate web page specifications (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 32-35 – Ferrel discloses "merging [the specified elements]" in that the story objects are fitted onto the templates through use of the style sheets).

*Claim 14:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 6, wherein:

- said master specification as well as both of said first and second subordinate web page specifications express the respective specifications using a markup language having language elements for specifying control information in a control section (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 36-50 – Ferrel discloses “specifying the master and first and second subordinate web page specifications by using a markup language to specify control information in a control section” in that the templates and the story objects are HTML documents that reference style sheets to retrieve formatting information; these references to the style sheets in the templates and the story objects are the “control information”);
- said specification of common content placement comprises specification of a content section whose content is to be included from a referencing subordinate web page specification (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 36-50 – Ferrel discloses “specifying a content section whose content is to be included from a referencing subordinate web page specification” in that both the templates and the associated story objects reference the corresponding style sheets, and the story objects are “poured into” the templates upon rendering);
- said first and second subordinate web page specifications specify first and second content in first and second content sections of said first and second subordinate web page specifications respectively (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 36-50 – Ferrel discloses “specifying first and second content in first and second content sections of said first and second subordinate web page

specifications respectively” in that the story objects include the content; the examiner notes that this limitation essential recites that “the content objects includes the content” to be poured into the templates); and

- each of said generating of said first and second resultant web pages comprises merging said specification of at least one of a reference to a style definition and a reference to a navigation arrangement in the control section of the master specification and the corresponding one of said first and second other control information in the control section of the corresponding one of said first and second subordinate web page specifications (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 32-35 – Ferrel discloses generating the web pages by “merging [the specified elements]” in that the story objects are fitted onto the templates through use of the style sheets).

*Claim 15:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 6, wherein:

- said first and second resultant web pages are referenced by first and second identifiers (see Column 8, Line 12 through Column 9, Line 46 – Ferrel discloses an online newspaper comprising templates and story objects, both of which are HTML documents, and thus impliedly discloses “first and second identifiers” for the story objects);
- said method further comprises receiving said first and second identifiers requesting for said first and second resultant web pages (see Column 8, Line 12

through Column 9, Line 46 – Ferrel discloses an online newspaper comprising templates and story objects, both of which are HTML documents, and thus impliedly discloses “receiving requests for the web pages” from readers of the online newspaper); and

- at least said generations of said first and second resultant web pages are performed responsive to the corresponding receiving of said first and second identifiers (see Column 8, Line 12 through Column 9, Line 46 – Ferrel discloses rendering an online newspaper comprising templates and story objects, both of which are HTML documents, and thus impliedly discloses “generation of the web pages that is responsive to receiving requests” for the corresponding pages of the online newspaper).

*Claim 16:*

Ferrel discloses an apparatus for generating a web page (see Column 1, Lines 5-7), comprising:

- storage medium having stored therein programming instructions, when executed, operate the apparatus to (see Column 10, Line 11 through Column 12, Line 21 – Ferrel discloses this limitation in that the system includes storage that hold the programs used to generate the web pages):
  - receive a master specification defining a common design for resultant web pages to be generated, specifying common content placement and at least one of common style and common navigation arrangement for each

- of said resultant web pages to be generated (as discussed in the above rejection for Claim 6, Ferrel discloses this limitation);
- receive a first subordinate web page specification defining first content for a first resultant web page to be generated, specifying said first content for said first resultant web page to be generated, and referencing the master specification for content placement and at least one of style and navigation (as discussed in the above rejection for Claim 6, Ferrel discloses this limitation);
  - receive a second subordinate web page specification defining second content for a second resultant web page to be generated, specifying said second content for said second resultant web page to be generated, and referencing the master specification for content placement and at least one of style and navigation (as discussed in the above rejection for Claim 6, Ferrel discloses this limitation); and
  - generating said first and second resultant web pages with said first and second contents being placed, styled and/or having a common navigation arrangement in accordance with said common placement and at least one of style and navigation arrangement specified by said master specification (as discussed in the above rejection for Claim 6, Ferrel discloses this limitation); and
- a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions (see Column 10, Line 11 through Column 12, Line 21 – Ferrel

discloses this limitation in that the system includes a processor to execute the programs used to generate the web pages).

*Claims 17 and 18:*

Claims 17 and 18 correspond to Claims 13 and 14, respectively. Thus, Claims 17 and 18 are rejected using the same rationale indicated in the above rejections for Claims 13 and 14.

*Claim 19:*

Ferrel discloses an article of manufacture for generating a web page (see Column 1, Lines 5-7), comprising:

- a storage medium (see Column 10, Line 11 through Column 12, Line 21 – Ferrel discloses this limitation in that the system includes storage); and
- a plurality of programming instructions stored in said storage medium to program an apparatus to enable the apparatus to (see Column 10, Line 11 through Column 12, Line 21 – Ferrel discloses this limitation in that the system includes storage that hold the programs used to generate the web pages):
  - receive a master specification defining a common design for resultant web pages to be generated, specifying common content placement and at least one of common style and common navigation arrangement for each of said resultant web pages to be generated (as discussed in the above rejection for Claim 6, Ferrel discloses this limitation);

- receive a first subordinate web page specification defining first content for a first resultant web page to be generated, specifying said first content for said first resultant web page to be generated, and referencing the master specification (as discussed in the above rejection for Claim 6, Ferrel discloses this limitation), deferring to the master specification for content placement and at least one of style and navigation (see Column 19, Lines 36-51 – Ferrel discloses this limitation in that the story objects include formatting tags that represent specific styles but the story objects reference the style sheets to receive all formatting information such as fonts, etc.);
- receive a second subordinate web page specification defining second content for a second resultant web page to be generated, specifying said second content for said second resultant web page to be generated, and referencing the master specification (as discussed in the above rejection for Claim 6, Ferrel discloses this limitation), deferring to the master specification for content placement and at least one of style and navigation (see Column 19, Lines 36-51 – Ferrel discloses this limitation in that the story objects include formatting tags that represent specific styles but the story objects reference the style sheets to receive all formatting information such as fonts, etc.);
- generate said first and second resultant web pages with said first and second contents being placed, styled and/or having a common navigation

arrangement in accordance with said common placement and at least one of style and navigation arrangement specified by said master specification (as discussed in the above rejection for Claim 6, Ferrel discloses this limitation).

*Claims 20 and 21:*

Claims 20 and 21 correspond to Claims 13 and 14, respectively. Thus, Claims 20 and 21 are rejected using the same rationale indicated in the above rejections for Claims 13 and 14.

*Claim 22:*

Ferrel discloses a web page generation method (see Column 1, Lines 5-7), comprising:

- receiving a master specification defining a design for one or more resultant web pages to be generated (as discussed in the above rejection for Claim 6, Ferrel discloses this limitation), specifying in a first control section at least one of style and navigation arrangement, and in a first content section first content placement for each of the one or more resultant web pages to be generated (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 36-50 – Ferrel discloses “specifying at least one of style and navigation arrangement in a first control section” and “specifying first content placement for each of the one or more web pages to be generated in a first content section” in that the templates are HTML documents that reference style

sheets to retrieve formatting information; thus, the templates specify “style” and “navigation arrangement” in a “first control section” and “first content placement” in a “first content section” of the HTML template documents);

- receiving a first subordinate web page specification defining first content for a first resultant web page to be generated (as discussed in the above rejection for Claim 6, Ferrel discloses this limitation), referencing in a second control section the master specification for content placement and at least one of style and common navigation (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses this limitation in that the story objects are HTML documents that reference, in “second control sections,” the associated controls and the corresponding style sheets to determine what content to display on the web pages and where to display said content on said pages), and specifying in a second content section said first content (the story objects “specify the first content in a second content section” in that the story objects are HTML documents that include the content to be displayed on the web pages); and
- generating said first resultant web page, adopting said first control section and first content section of said first specification and merging said specified first content into said first content section, resulting with said first content being placed, styled and/or having a common navigation arrangement in accordance with said common placement and at least one of style and navigation arrangement specified by said master specification (see Figures 8, 9 and 14; see

Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62 – Ferrel discloses this limitation as clearly indicated in the cited figure and text; also, the foregoing discussion indicates that Ferrel discloses these elements).

*Claim 23:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 22, wherein:

- said first subordinate web page specification further specifying other control information in said second control section (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 36-50 – Ferrel discloses “other control information in said second control section of the first subordinate web page specification” in that the story objects are HTML documents that reference style sheets to retrieve formatting information; these references to the style sheets in the story objects are the “other control information”); and
- said generating of said first resultant web page further comprises merging said other control information in said adopted first control section (see Figure 8; see Column 19, Lines 32-35 – Ferrel discloses “merging other control information” in that the story objects are fitted onto the templates through use of the style sheets and the “other control information” is that part of the web pages that link the web pages to the templates and the associated style sheets).

*Claim 26:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 22, wherein:

- said master specification further specifies in a second content section, second content placement for each of the one or more resultant web pages to be generated, and said first subordinate web page referencing said first content section of said master specification for said first content placement (as specified in the above rejection for Claim 1, the template in Ferrel discloses “content placement” for both the first and second web pages; thus, Ferrel discloses a first content section that identifies a first content placement for the first web page and a second content section that identifies a second content placement for the second web page);
- said method further comprises receiving a second subordinate web page specification defining second content for said second content placement for said first resultant web page to be generated, referencing in a third control section the second content placement of the master specification for content placement and at least one of style and common navigation, and specifying in a third content section said second content (as specified in the above rejection for Claim 1, the template in Ferrel discloses “content placement” for both the first and second web pages; thus, Ferrel discloses a third content section that identifies a second content for a second content placement for the first web page in a second web page specification and a third control section that identifies a second content placement for the second web page that specifies the style, common navigation and content placement of the second content); and

- said generating of said first resultant web page further comprises merging said specified second content into said second content section, resulting with said second content being placed, styled and/or having a common navigation arrangement in accordance with said common placement and at least one of style and navigation arrangement specified by said master specification (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Ferrel discloses this limitation).

*Claim 27:*

Ferrel discloses the method of Claim 22, wherein said first control section of said master specification comprises at least one variable control, and said second control section of said first subordinate web page specification comprises a control value for one of said at least one variable control (see Figure 8 – Ferrel discloses this limitation in that the templates contain controls - “variable controls” - into which the story objects – “control values” - are poured).

*Claim 28:*

Ferrel discloses an apparatus for generating a web page (see Column 1, Lines 5-7), comprising:

- storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions, when executed, operate the apparatus to (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 19, Ferrel discloses this limitation):

- receive a master specification defining a design for one or more resultant web pages to be generated, specifying in a first control section at least one of style and navigation arrangement, and in a first content section content placement for each of the one or more resultant web pages to be generated (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 22, Ferrel discloses this limitation),
- receive a first subordinate web page specification defining first content for a first resultant web page to be generated, referencing in a second control section the master specification (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 22, Ferrel discloses this limitation), deferring to the master specification for content placement and at least one of style and common navigation (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 19, Ferrel discloses this limitation), and specifying in a second content section said first content (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 22, Ferrel discloses this limitation), and
- generate said first resultant web page, adopting said first control section and first content section of said master specification and merging said specified first content into said first content section, resulting with said first content being placed, styled and/or having a common navigation arrangement in accordance with said common placement and at least one of style and navigation arrangement specified by said master specification

- (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 22, Ferrel discloses this limitation); and
- a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 16, Ferrel discloses this limitation).

*Claim 29:*

Ferrel discloses the apparatus of Claim 28, wherein:

- said second specification further specifying other control information in said second control section (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 13, Ferrel discloses this limitation); and
- said generating of said first resultant web page further comprises merging said other control information in said adopted first control section (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 23, Ferrel discloses this limitation).

*Claim 32:*

As indicated in the above discussion, Ferrel discloses every limitation of Claim 28.

This claim corresponds to Claim 26 and is thus rejected using the same rationale set forth in the above rejection for Claim 26.

*Claim 33:*

As indicated in the above discussion, Ferrel discloses every limitation of Claim 28.

This claim corresponds to Claim 27 and is thus rejected using the same rationale set forth in the above rejection for Claim 27.

---

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel, in view of Keating, U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2002/0052895.

***Claim 25:***

As indicated in the above discussion, Ferrel discloses every limitation of Claim 22. Ferrel also discloses:

- said master specification as well as said first subordinate web page specification express the respective specifications having language elements for specifying

control information in a control section (as discussed in the above rejections for

Claims 5 and 8, Ferrel discloses these limitations);

- said master specification specifies said content placement (as discussed in the above rejection for Claim 6, Ferrel discloses this limitation) by specifying within said design specification the content that is to be included from a referencing subordinate web page specification (as discussed in the above rejections for Claims 6 and 11, Ferrel discloses this limitation); and
- said first subordinate web page specification specifying said first content within said first subordinate web page specification (as discussed in the above rejection for Claim 6, Ferrel discloses this limitation); and
- said generating of said first resultant web page comprises merging the content of the subordinate web page specification into the design specification (as discussed in the above rejection for Claim 14, Ferrel discloses this limitation).

Ferrel fails to expressly disclose:

- said master specification and said first subordinate web page specification being written in XHTML.

Keating teaches a web page generation method (see Paragraphs 0001-0003),

wherein:

- a master specification and a first subordinate web page specification are written in XHTML (see Paragraphs 0010 and 0032),

for the purpose of maintaining compatibility with HTML 4 browsers (see Paragraph 0007).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Ferrel, to include:

- a master specification and a first subordinate web page specification that are written in XHTML,

for the purpose of maintaining compatibility with HTML 4 browsers, as taught in Keating.

Ferrel, in view of Keating, fails to expressly disclose:

- said master specification specifying within said design specification a *<body>* section whose content is to be included from a referencing subordinate web page specification;
- said first subordinate web page specification specifying said first content by specifying within said first subordinate web page specification a *<body> section*; and
- merging the content of the *<body>* section of the subordinate web page specification into the *<body>* section of the design specification.

However, the *<BODY>* tag of an HTML document comprises the content of the web page including what content is to be placed on the web page and where on the web page to put the content. One of ordinary skill in the art, a web page author, would have typically included all references to content objects that are to be displayed on a web

page inside the <BODY> section of the template. Thus, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to:

- specify within said design specification of said master specification a <body> section whose content is to be included from a referencing subordinate web page specification;
- specify said first content of said first subordinate web page specification by specifying within said first subordinate web page specification a <body> section; and
- merging the content of the <body> section of the subordinate web page specification into the <body> section of the design specification,

for the purpose of specifying the particular content to be included on the web pages that are generated using templates and associated content objects.

*Claim 31:*

As indicated in the above discussion, Ferrel discloses every limitation of Claim 28.

This claim corresponds to Claim 25 and is thus rejected using the same rationale set forth in the above rejection for Claim 25.

Claims 24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel, in view of Lie et al., "Cascading Style Sheets, level 1" **W3C**

**Recommendation** 17 Dec 1996, revised 11 Jan 1999 ([www.w3.org/TR/CSS1](http://www.w3.org/TR/CSS1)) and Keating.

*Claim 24:*

As indicated in the above discussion, Ferrel discloses every limitation of Claim 22.

Ferrel fails to disclose:

- said master specification as well as said first subordinate web page specification express the respective specifications using the XHTML having a <head> section for specifying control information;
- said specification of at least one of a common style and a navigation arrangement comprises specifying at least one of a reference to a style definition and a reference to a navigation arrangement in the <head> section of the design specification; and
- said generating of said first resultant web page comprises adopting said <head> section of said design specification.

Lie teaches a web page generation method (see "Abstract" on Page 1 of 70), comprising:

- a master specification and a first subordinate web page specification expressing the respective specifications using the HTML having a <head> section for

specifying control information (see “Containment in HTML” on Page 6 of 70 – the HTML document includes “control information,” links to the associated style sheet, in the <HEAD> section);

- said specification of at least one of a common style and a navigation arrangement comprises specifying at least one of a reference to a style definition and a reference to a navigation arrangement in the <head> section of the design specification (see “Containment in HTML” on Page 6 of 70 – reference to the associated style sheet comprises a “reference to a style definition”); and
- said generating of said first resultant web page comprises adopting said <head> section of said design specification (generation of the web page results in the “adoption” of the “style definition” specified through reference to the associated style sheet in the <HEAD> section),

for the purpose of linking the HTML document to the associated style sheets so as to control the way the web page is presented.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Ferrel, to include:

- said master specification as well as said first subordinate web page specification express the respective specifications using the HTML having a <head> section for specifying control information;
- said specification of at least one of a common style and a navigation arrangement comprises specifying at least one of a reference to a style definition

and a reference to a navigation arrangement in the <head> section of the design specification; and

- said generating of said first resultant web page comprises adopting said <head> section of said design specification,

for the purpose of linking the HTML document to the associated style sheets so as to control the way the web page is presented, as taught in Lie.

---

Ferrel, in view of Lie, fails to disclose a master specification and a first subordinate web page specification written in XHTML.

Keating teaches a web page generation method (see Paragraphs 0001-0003), wherein:

- a master specification and a first subordinate web page specification are written in XHTML (see Paragraphs 0010 and 0032),

for the purpose of maintaining compatibility with HTML 4 browsers (see Paragraph 0007).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Ferrel, in view of Lie, to include:

- a master specification and a first subordinate web page specification that are written in XHTML,

for the purpose of maintaining compatibility with HTML 4 browsers, as taught in Keating.

*Claim 30:*

As indicated in the above discussion, Ferrel discloses every limitation of Claim 28.

This claim corresponds to Claim 24 and is thus rejected using the same rationale set forth in the above rejection for Claim 24.

---

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Ferrel et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,199,082; King et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,161,114; Hill et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,023,714; Lie et al., "*Cascading Style Sheets, level 1*" **W3C Recommendation** 17 Dec 1996, revised 11 Jan 1999 ([www.w3.org/TR/CSS1](http://www.w3.org/TR/CSS1)); and Pemberton et al., "*XHTML 1.0: The Extensible HyperText Markup Language*" **W3C Recommendation** 26 January 2000 ([www.w3.org/TR/2000/REC-xhtml1-20000126/](http://www.w3.org/TR/2000/REC-xhtml1-20000126/)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (703) 305-1701. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (703) 308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Art Unit: 2179

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

WDH  
September 3, 2004



**DOUG HUTTON  
PATENT EXAMINER  
TECH CENTER 2100**